

Appl. No. 10/692,971  
Reply to Office Action of July 29, 2005

### REMARKS

The July 29, 2005 Office Action contends that Applicant's last response, mailed on May 6, 2005, is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action. The July 29, 2005 Office Action alleges that the drawings do not show a thrusting device coupled to first and second members as claimed. In particular, the Office Action states that the "thrusting device appears to be attached to the missile fairing as opposed to flanged first and second members." Applicant respectfully disagrees with this conclusion and, accordingly, declines to amend the claims or the drawings at this time. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

As mentioned in Applicant's previous response, an example "thrusting device" as recited in the claims is depicted in both FIG. 12 and FIG. 13, and is called out by reference number 1003. In the illustrated embodiment, thrusting device 1003 includes two springs. The embodiment shown in FIG. 12 and FIG. 13 is described at paragraphs 0046 and 0047 of the specification. In FIG. 12, the fairing 1000 is joined together by a separation joint 1001. Although FIG. 12 simply depicts the separation joint 1001 as a line between the two halves of the fairing 1000, the specification states that the separation joint 1001 is a separation joint as described in FIGS. 7-11 (paragraph 0046). Due to the drawing scale of FIG. 12 and FIG. 13, the details of the separation joint 1001 have been omitted. Nonetheless, the remaining drawings and the description make it clear that the separation joint 1001 is coupled to the halves of the fairing 1000. Furthermore, FIG. 12 and FIG. 13 depict how the thrusting device 1003 is coupled to the halves of the fairing 1000, as mentioned in the Office Action and as described in Applicant's specification.

Claim 1, which is representative of the pending claims, recites "a thrusting device coupled to said first and second members to accelerate said first and second members away from one another upon decoupling" (emphasis added). In the context of claim 1, the "first and second members" are the flanged elements of the separation joint. Notably, the claim language does not require a direct attachment of the thrusting device to the first and second members, and, therefore, Applicant submits that such direct attachment need not be depicted in the figures. Rather, FIG. 12 and FIG. 13 depict an example embodiment where the thrusting device 1003 is coupled to the separation joint 1001 via the respective halves of the fairing 1000.

Appl. No. 10/692,971  
Reply to Office Action of July 29, 2005

Therefore, the recited claim feature at issue is shown in the original drawings. Moreover, in view of the above clarification, Applicant believes that the drawings currently of record fully satisfy all of the requirements of the Office, and that the drawings are more than adequate to enable one skilled in the art to understand the subject matter to be patented, particularly when viewed along with a reading of Applicant's specification.


In conclusion, for the reasons given above, Applicant requests the withdrawal of the drawing objection. Should the Examiner have any questions or wish to further discuss this application, Applicants request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney at (480) 385-5060.

If for some reason Applicants have not requested a sufficient extension and/or have not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent abandonment on this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: Aug. 11, 2005

By:   
Mark M. Takahashi  
Reg. No. 38,631  
(480) 385-5060